PARTS OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

ARE OF POOR REPRODUCTIVE QUALITY

CERTAINES PARTIES DU DOCUMENT ORIGINAL

SONT DE PIÈTRE QUALITÉ DE REPRODUCTION

EVALUATING SCHOOL PROGRAMS:
A
COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

May 12-13,1988
(Winnipeg,Manitoba)

CONFERENCE REPORT

A Registration Distribution and Totals Report

B Sessions Registration and Evaluation Form Report

C "Comments" from the Evaluation Forms

THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

May 31,1988

THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Sandy Millen (Chairperson)
Winnipeg School Division # 1
Manitoba Teachers'Society

John Ilavsky
St.Vital School Division # 6
Manitoba Association
of
School Superintendents

Ernie Shume
St.Boniface School Division # 4
Manitoba Association
of
Principals

Jocelyn Johnson
Turtle Mountain School Division # 44
Manitoba Association
of
School Trustees

Judy Aiken
Home & School & Parent-
Teacher Federation of Manitoba

Jane Turner
Early Years Consultant
Manitoba Education

Al Johannson
Middle Years Consultant
Manitoba Education

Monty Szakacs
Senior Years Consultant
Manitoba Education

Gary McEwen
Social Studies Consultant
Manitoba Education

Odarka Trosky
Faculty of Education
University of Manitoba

Special Thanks to:

Lynn Harrison
Secretary
Manitoba Education

Linda Johnson
Secretary
Manitoba Education

Vivian Banks
Secretary
Manitoba Teachers'Society

A

Prepared by Gary McBean
Planning Committee
May 16, 1988

EVALUATING SCHOOL PROGRAMS: A COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

Registration Distribution and Totals Report

D - Division/District
S - Superintendent's Office
P - Principal/Vice Principal
T - Teacher/Resource
P.D. - Professional Development Chairperson
C - Consultant
S.T. - School Trustee
O - Other (1)
Pr. - Presenter

D	S	P	T	P.D.	C	S.T.	O	Pr.	Total
# 1	3	3	6		4		6	2	24
# 2	1	2	1		2		2	2	10
# 3	1	6							7
# 4	1	3	2			1	1	1	9
# 5		18	9		3	4	2		36
# 6		5	6		3	1	2	2	19
# 8			3			1	1		5
# 9	1	12	9		3	1	1		27
#10		2							2
#11	1	1	2					1	5
#12	2	4			1		1	3	10
#13									
#14	1	1	2		3				7
#15						1			1
#16									
#17		3	1						4
#18		1				1	1		3
#19	1								1
#20						2			2
#21			1	1					2
#22			1						1
#23	1	1							2
#24	1	1			1				3
#25		2				2	1		5
#26	2	3	1	1		1			8
#27	1	2	2	1	1				7
#28									
#29	1	2							3
#30	1	6		1		2	1		11
#31	1	2	1			1			5
#32	1	1				1			3
#33								1	1
#34	1	1	1			1			4
#35								1	1
#36									
#37		1							1
#38									
#39	1	1							2
#40	1	5	1				2	1	0
#41		1							1
#42	1	2	1	1	1	1			7
#43									
#44	1	1	1						3
#45			1						1
#46									
#47	1	3	8	1		1	3		17
#48	3	5	7		6	1	3	1	26
#2151		1	1			1			3
#2314									
#2340									
#2408	1	1	2			1			5
#2346									
#2399			2	1		2			5
#2312									
#2359	1	5	3		1	3			13
#3439									
#3440									
#3441									
[illegible]		1					1		2
[illegible]		1	8				1		10
[illegible]		2	1				1		4
[illegible]	1	2	1			1	1		6
[illegible]		1	1						2
[illegible]	3	1			1		1		6
[illegible]					6		1		7
[illegible]					3		1		4
[illegible]					12		4	4	30
[illegible]							3	3	6
[illegible]								2	2
[illegible]								2	2
[illegible]								3	3
[illegible]								0	0
[illegible]	26	124	98	7	53	31	41	38(3)	428(2)

Notes:

(1) Other - Includes Special Constituency; Parents; Community College personnel; Librarians; Program Review Committee Members plus some Delegates who did not check any of the "appropriate boxes".

(2) Including the 38 Presenters (#D-38), there were 370 Delegates at the Conference.

(3) Thirty presenters were from Manitoba; five were from Ontario; two from Alberta and one from British Columbia.

EVALUATING SCHOOL PROGRAMS: A COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1988

PLENARY SESSION

TWO PERSPECTIVES ON PROGRAM EVALUATION

9:00 - 9:15	Opening Remarks	Sandy Hillen (Chairperson)
9:15 - 10:15	Perspective 'A'	Dr. Mark Holmes (OISE)
10:15 - 10:45	Coffee	
10:45 - 11:45	Perspective 'B'	Dr. Norma Mickelson (University of Victoria)

11:45 - 1:00 LUNCH

CONCURRENT SESSIONS

THEORY AND APPLICATION

SESSION	1:00 - 2:15	SESSION	2:45 - 4:00
1	Whole Language Program Evaluation Dr. Norma Mickelson University of Victoria		Continuation of Session 1
2	Mathematics Program Evaluation Dr. David Ireland Carleton Board of Education		Continuation of Session 2
3	English Language Arts Program Evaluation Dr. Margaret Stevenson Edmonton Public Schools		Continuation of Session 3
4	School Library Program E[illegible]n Adrienne Batty Calgary Board of Education		Continuation of Session 4
5	School System Evaluation: System Satisfaction Survey Roger Kangas, Superintendent St. Vital S.D.	11	A Division and School Planning and Review Process for Assessing School Programs by Focusing Upon Student Needs Vera Derenchuk, Superintendent and Divisional Consultants Transcona-Springfield S.D.
6	Program Evaluation in a Native School Community Dr. Anthony Riffel/Dr. Bruce Sealey University of Manitoba	12	Program Evaluation: The English/French Writing Assessment Gérald Gagnon St. Boniface S.D.
7	Program Evaluation-Vocational/Business Education Barry Madeley Dauphin-Ochre S.D.	13	Program Evaluation and Special Needs: Community Involvement Ken Halldorson, Superintendent Lord Selkirk S.D.
8	Program Evaluation in the Writing Process Ian Hamberg Brandon S.D.	14	Program Evaluation and Special Band Program CANCELLED Dr. Elie Lamb, Superintendent Swan Valley S.D.
9	Program [illegible] CANCELLED Safety, [illegible] Marilyn Fremont Seven Oaks S.D.	15	The Program Evaluation Process: High School Review Panel Panel Members Manitoba Education
10	French Immersion Evaluation: A Provincial Perspective Dr. Ron Duhamel/John Ilevsky U. of M./St. Vital S.D.		

PLENARY SESSION

7:00 P.M. - 8:30 P.M. — COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAM EVALUATION

Viewpoints from Dr. Holmes and Dr. Mickelson
Chairperson and Reactor: Dr. Eric MacPherson

8:30 P.M. - 10:00 P.M. — Coffee, Conversation and Cash Bar

EVALUATING SCHOOL PROGRAMS: A COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

FRIDAY, MAY 13, 1988

CONCURRENT SESSIONS

THEORY AND APPLICATION

SESSION	9:00 - 10:15	SESSION	10:45 - 12:00
16	Whole Language Program Evaluation Repeat of Session 1		Continuation of Session 16
17	English Language Arts Program Evaluation Dr. David Ireland Carleton Board of Education		Continuation of Session 17
18	English Language Arts Program Evaluation Repeat of Session 3		Continuation of Session 18
19	Secondary Science Program Evaluation Linda Lee/Ron Bannister Winnipeg S.D.		Continuation of Session 19
20	Program Evaluation of Early Years Education Frances Poleschuk Primary Education Consultant		Continuation of Session 20
21	Issues in Program Evaluation Dr. Mark Holmes Ontario Institute for Studies in Education	25	Issues in Program Evaluation Repeat of Session 21
22	The Principal and Program Evaluation at the School Level Roger Cathcart/Ernie Baydock St. James-Assiniboia S.D.	26	A Total School Program Evaluation and Follow-Up Dr. Lloyd Nelson Frontier S.D.
23	Program Evaluation - The EXCEL Report Gerald Dureault Manitoba Teachers' Society	27	Provincial Assessment of Writing CANCELLED Language Arts Consultant Manitoba Education
24	Program Evaluation of School Guidance and Counselling Services Dennis Lucas Manitoba Education	28	The Provincial Kindergarten Assessment Annette Boland-Willms Manitoba Education
		29	Program Evaluation: The Model CANCELLED Joan McLaren

12:00 - 1:15 LUNCH

PLENARY SESSION

1:15 - 2:15	PROGRAM EVALUATION AND PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY: TWO PERSPECTIVES Dr. Holmes and Dr. Mickelson	
2:15 - 2:45	Coffee	
2:45 - 3:30	Reaction Panel	
	Benji Levin (Chairperson)	Val Wake (MTS)
	Judy Silver (MAST)	Sonja Anderson (CHSPTF)
	Elie Lamb (MASS)	Tim Sale (Manitoba Education)

EVALUATING SCHOOL PROGRAMS: A COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP
MAY 12-13, 1988

B

SESSIONS REGISTRATION and EVALUATION FORM REPORT (1)

CONCURRENT SESSIONS		Number of Delegates Registered (2)	Not informative or applicable				Very informative and relevant	TOTAL # OF FORMS
Session	Speaker(s)		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Norma Mickelson	93		2	5	23	15	45
2	David Ireland / Peter Moskos / Ron Bender	52	3	4	3	1	3	14
3	Margaret Stevenson	34	9	5	4		1	19
4	Adrienne Betty	17				1	4	5
5	Roger Kangas	63	1	3	8	9	3	24
6	Tony Riffel	23	1	3	1		1	6
7	Barry Nadolny	11			2	3	2	7
8	Ian Hamberg	23		1	2	5	4	12
10	Ron Duhamel / John Ilavsky	26	1	3	5	4	1	14
11	Vera Derenchuk; Norma Robson	78	2	4	11	10	3	30
12	Gerald Gagnon	11		2	3	2	1	8
13	Olff Hardy	28		6	6	7	2	21
15	High School Review Panel	30	5	3	3	2	2	15
16	Norma Mickelson (Repeat of #1)	61		2	1	9	15	26
17	Ireland et al	19	1			1	6	8
18	Marg. Stevenson (Repeat of #3)	22	3	1	6	4	1	15
19	Linda Lee Ron Bannister	8	1			3	1	5
20	Frances Poleschuk	52	1	1	3	8	5	18
21	Mark Holmes	73	1	2	9	16	8	36
22	Ernie Baydock / Roger Cathcart	55	1	2	8	9	2	22
23	Gerry Dureault	11			1	3	1	5
24	Dennis Lucas	25			1	6	4	11
25	Mark Holmes (Repeat of #21)	36		1	2	7	2	12
26	Lloyd Nelson	113	3	6	16	16	8	49
28	Annette Boland-Willms	9			6	2		8

PLENARY SESSIONS		1	2	3	4	5	
Thursday May 12, 1988	Mark Holmes	5	10	26	65	36	142
	Norma Mickelson	5	22	42	54	23	146
	Evening	1	6	11	16	2	36
Friday May 13, 1988	Holmes and Mickelson	2	11	45	41	24	123
	Reaction Panel	1	4	22	39	22	88
	OVERALL CONFERENCE	1		26	69	16	112

NOTES

(1) 152 Evaluation Forms were submitted Friday afternoon at the end of the Conference. Some delegates wrote comments and did not indicate their 1-5 scale preference while others indicated a preference but not for all aspects of the conference.

(2) The figures are accurate up to the start of the Conference. Session counts by presenters indicate that some delegates varied their preferences as the Conference proceeded.

Prepared by Gary McEwen
Planning Committee
May 18, 1988

- This conference was superb! It was a challenge to a system that is rather comfortable. By presenting 2 extremes people were really forced to struggle with their lack of comfort. I thank you for making me think.

- Overall - an excellent conference! A good variety of sessions and very well organized! Congratulations to the Planning Committee! Hope to see you again next May!

- I found that there was little time for group interaction and clarification of our own ideas. This would be useful to foster our own change.

- Session 3 - Overheads not visible and couldn't be followed. Materials distributed after discussion - why not before so we could follow.

  Informal session at end - very interesting and beneficial.

  Plenary - Thursday A.M. - It is discouraging to see so-called role models being so rude - leaving before speakers are finished - talking during presentations. How would they react if students/staff did likewise?

  The main presenters were spread far too thinly - too much was expected of them! Thursday evening was a repetition of Thursday A.M. (i.e. did NOT follow topic) and Friday afternoon was a further repetition. Enough is enough!

- A number of the speakers had a different interpretation of the topic they were presenting than I expected to hear. I could be at fault here but nevertheless I didn't get the information I expected.

- Thursday evening appeared to be an overload by size of audience.

  Keynote speakers were very good but overworked with Friday P.M. as well as Thursday evening session.

  Facilities were very good. Well organized.

- Generally informative and thought provoking but sometimes repetitive.

- Presenters from rural, smaller school divisions would be useful. Possibly concurrent sessions for different sized schools may even be useful.

- Very stimulating, thought provoking. An opportunity to hear from very informative people. Also an excellent chance to meet others from across the province and exchange ideas and views.

- A number of things which I have heard during the past two days can be transferred to our schools. Some good, practical ideas!

- More parents need to know what's going on. Thanks for the opportunity.

- I would have liked to have had the Friday afternoon to gather as divisional teams in order to put their ideas together and produce some kind of an action plan that would be in conjunction with what we have learned during the conference.

- There seemed to be a misunderstanding on the part of some presenters on the distinction between student evaluation and program evaluation. Much of the effectiveness of many sessions was lost because the speakers talked about student evaluation and could not address the key issue of programs which I understood was the purpose of the conference.

- Some concern about Holmes dwelling on constraints and narrower focus - reinforcing biases.

- A good conference - congratulations! The speakers were thought-provoking enough to make us realize how far we've come and how far we must go in our own situations. Personally I would have enjoyed becoming more "in depth re evaluation" but this is impossible in such large group sessions.

- A fine conference! I had wished that we could scratch beneath the surface of a demanding, fascinating and pragmatic issue. Humans should be asked to do those things that they can identify a beginning, a middle and an end.

  Evaluation is a necessary ingredient in the education of our youth.

- Program evaluation sessions were not broad enough elementary/junior high/ senior high - non-core subject areas; Thursday p.m. sessions very narrow in scope i.e. high school focus/division focus only.

- The topic, program evaluation, requires much more attention in our schools. How this can be best achieved still remains to be answered. I accept our responsibility to be accountable to our public and see testing as an important means of doing this but...will we ever achieve the kind of consensus from the public as to what it is that we should be doing?

- Session #3 was not meaningful for me as it was aimed at "3-6-9 level". Perhaps, with the advance material, there might be a short commentary or a level indicator to help one make a selection.

  The Plenary Session brought the two "opposing" viewpoints into a heightened awareness.

- One concern that I had about the conference - although Dr. Holmes was a very dynamic speaker for educators and played the "devil's advocate" well, I am concerned that school trustees and parents in attendance would go back to their communities filled with misinformation. His "put downs" of e.g. whole language strategies are not based on research and he obviously has not studied, in depth, language acquisition. Would a person like Frank Smith have been a better choice to defend himself against such a strong person like Dr. Holmes??? Norma Mickelson is such a fine, caring, kind educator!

- N.B. Reaction panel should be given more time. As a parent outsider, with a background in stats health care evaluation, urban planning evaluation it is interesting to see how various education professionals approach evaluation of their programmes. Some speakers have been patronizing - "The public wouldn't understand". Those that want to would understand and learn. Standardized testing is met with fear by teachers who think it will lead to a witch hunt. However, it should be an integral part of public information for those people who want to know. School divisions could do a much better job in their publications. They should set out their goals/objectives lucidly and work to communicate much better with public/community.

- Presenters should be guided by time so that a few minutes at the end of their presentations can be used for group interaction.

- The titles of some of the sessions are very vague (deceiving). They gave the impression of general things being dealt with as in the Math Prog. Evaluation session. However some turned out to be so specific that at times they were of no help to me. I'd like to see a more detailed description of the sessions.

- I was really impressed by the punctuality of session leaders and speakers. (Both start and stop times).

  An excellent conference - similar conferences should be held again.

  Should provide juices as an alternative for coffee at breaks.

- Well organized.
  Opportunity for discussion even though "Board Room" set up of room did not facilitate this.

- Presenting different points of view - good. Would have benefitted from the opportunity for small-group discussion. (Other than just at coffee break) - was tired of being "lectured" to!

  Well-organized! Thanks.

- I thought Mickelson was weak - a stronger advocate could/should have been obtained.

- Because I was not aware of the real goals of this conference, it is difficult for me to EVALUATE whether the time, and effort has been worthwhile or achieved its goal. I guess this implies that I lean toward the medical model of evaluation rather than the "blind leading the blind".

- Very interesting and valuable conference due to the very mixed nature of participants - teachers/administrators/board, etc.

  Also useful was the "opposing" views of the 2 keynote speakers.

- Holmes/Mickelson sessions were by Friday, stretching the issues a bit thin.

  Better description of sessions (eg. appropriateness to type of school/ grade level) should have been provided before registering for conference.

- Informative and useful...The Thursday evening session was stopped before enough audience participation had occurred. I suggest the moderators or chairpersons allow for the fact that it takes people a while to warm up to asking questions so don't cut it off if in the beginning it appears people are not asking too many questions.

  Sessions Started and finished on time - that's good!

- Session #20 was first listed as "Program Evaluation of Early Years Education". It turned out to be a history of the Early Primary Education Project in Ontario - not what I had wanted at all.

  This facility is terrible for inservices. Rooms are cold, line ups for coffee far too long and I had the same awful meal Thursday that was served at the C.E.C. Conference.

- Well organized, thought provoking.

  Friday p.m. session functioned as a good summary and did highlight the points we should go home and think about.

- The hotel facility was inadequate and meals were terrible.

  I was very disappointed in Dr. Holmes. His theories and philosophy of education were so "off base and negative". I was upset knowing that parents and trustees were exposed to his ideas. Thank goodness Dr. Mickelson followed him in both plenary sessions. Dr. Holmes' speeches can only create a wider chasm between school/trustee/parents.

- The Thursday's Plenary Session was okay, however, had difficulty with the comparison of the medical Profession with Education Profession. Can't be compared. Special needs, session #13 missed the ship, nothing re-evaluation, but an interesting presentation. Session #21 very good session alot of discussion. Session #26 appeared to have a view of how to do an evaluation of a large area, "school setting" - alot of good ideas - could be used as a model - In general - Good Conference.

- There was no emphasis or presentation on evaluation of the resources (books, films, AV. etc.) that support school program. How do we evaluate the situation in the school to see if we have the materials needed in order to properly implement any program which teaches students how to locate and internalize information.

- It has set a base for many 'to do' directions which will start in some cases and continue in others immediately and next year as directions in my school.

  I want to develop staff "teams" and to assist these teams in curricular development.

  An excellent conference for me. I hope to do a lot. I'll be pleased with the first steps and a slow process of development.

- When choosing presenters, be aware of the audience. Dr. Mickelson and Dr. Holmes presentation styles were very different. For the unaware - uneducated (trustees ?), his style enhanced his message and appeared neat, simplistic, comprehensive, while hers was more nebulous and vague. It's much easier to believe and understand numbers/tests than philosophy, theory. I would not want to have brought my trustees or teachers who are unwilling to change to hear him (i.e. the old is good - we don't need to change.)

- Appreciated the range of perspectives provided by the various speakers.

- Would like to see some group discussion - work shop?

  Two days of listening is tiring.

- Well organized.

- It would have been good for us to have the yellow sheets explaining in "more detail" the sessions before we made our choices. Some did not suit levels to which we are responsible or do the things we thought they were going to.

  An Excellent 2 days!!

- Super! Quality speakers and program only minor glitches - like it being too cold in the Skyview-Ballroom on first day. The larger no. of people who were present at the very last session reflects to the interest and quality of this conference.

- Each major speaker is too narrow in their respective areas:
  Holmes: too performance orientated when not accepting the "whole language" technique.
  Mickelson: far too naive about our society's (the world's) total existence centered on COMPETITION. Yes, "life is grey", but who wins scholarships, jobs, spouses etc. etc. How does less "competition" in ed's "save" the 1/3 of the children we lose?

- An excellent conference - good variety in type of session and length; content relevant, each addressed the purpose of the session; especially appreciated is the range of participants - a conference planned by and participated in by the five (six) major consultants of what education is all about gives us an opportunity to talk to and listen to (hear) each other. Well done!

- Disappointed there was no presentation from Provincial Assessment Program (general presentation) as a whole rather than just Writing Assessment. Was happy with 1 session of Norma's on evaluation of Whole Language. I hoped for more guidelines for a process to approach overall curriculum (program) evaluation.

- My experience was not very satisfying because I did not happen to get into the stimulating sessions. Perhaps the topic, tho' timely, is rather difficult to make continually interesting.

- Session 10 - research was not valid and was out dated.

  Session 15 Panel #5 gave more info. and challenge than all others (panel members) put together.

- Having two resource people who come from such opposing views about "learning" and about "evaluation" makes for some lively debate and some challenging statements. My concern however, is that for those attending the conference, who come from backgrounds that, did not contain opportunities to learn about new methodology and recent Theories the one whose debating skills were most sharp, and whose wit was ready, would come out the winner. This could translate back to the front line as a backward move toward evaluating in the quantitative. Lets publish the results.

- Many sessions were too specifically geared towards high school programs.

- I enjoyed the conference and applaud the committee for the work they have done. There is a need for a lot of work on this topic.

  Suggestion - better description of sessions and I ended up in a high school session which was well done but was not what I wanted and not what I expected.

- The overall conference presented two views of evaluation. There really hasn't been much on actual "program" evaluation. I enjoyed hearing Norma Mickelson in her small group session talking about "Whole Language" evaluation - but her keynote address on the first morning was confusing and perhaps shouldn't have been a rebuttal of Holmes' address.

- Particularly enjoyed and benefitted from presentation by Lloyd Nelson (#26). Very practical in content and well organized in terms of presentation. Inspiring. Thank you.

- #2 Thursday - listing did not identify that it was only for high school when registering.

  Cold uncomfortable metal seats.

- Overhead transparencies should only be used if they are visible to all people in the session.

- The speakers were both enlightners and mind provoking thoughts have been raised in mine and others thoughts. It excites me to be apart of this growth and change in education today.

- KEYNOTE - Holmes - raised question of political difficulties with his model, then ignored them.
  Mickelson - a Frank Smith review??

  #8 - covered too much territory - could be more focused - hand out was good.

  #11 - disappointing - whole concept is too big - too much input from too many people.

  #16 - spent little time on the important questions posed at the beginning of the session - a lot of unnecessary time spent on the philosophy and methodogy of whole language.

- Good speakers but too repetitious in their addresses. More opportunity for exchange would have been good.

- Dr. Homes' analogies were irrelevant to the points he was expounding.

- Ideas for future conferences
  Evaluation of School Professionals
  Focus on Methodology

- Facilities are poor at the Marlborough as well as the meals.

  A session on "program design" would be useful.

  According to Dr. Holmes, educational objectives should be set by the public. Which public? WASP?

- Sandy and committee, thanks for all the time and effort that you put into the organization of these 2 days. This has been one of the best conferences that I have ever attended, and I've attended a few.

  Thanks as well for providing tea at break.

- While speaker was speaking coffee cups were being cleaned up and the clatter was disruptive. A very interesting and informative conference.

- I was disappointed in two of the sessions that I attended; however, re: #26 - although it was not well presented, it did offer some positive direction for the improvement of a junior high school situation. The theory and application sessions did not have a practical enough basis - especially #3 which should have been publicized as an elementary - junior high session. #26 gave us a great deal of info. - perhaps handouts could have been provided. Prof. Holmes is an excellent speaker!

- Coffee breaks are too long. Even though there were many in attendance, coffee was easily accessible everywhere.

  Then this would have let us take in an extra session throughout the day instead of one extra session in the evening.

  Its okay to have an entertaining casual evening or chance to talk with both speakers as one may need to one evening.

- Session #1 - Norma Mickelson - topic was evaluation - not enough time spent on evaluation. The first hour and some were spent on selling whole language. It was good to hear about these ideas but it was important to me to hear about evaluation.

  Plenary Sessions - very thought provoking. Some of Holmes remarks upset me...that was a good sign that I wasn't bored. It certainly peaked my interest.

- Would like to see that speakers handouts are available at the time of a conference rather than their having to be mailed out.

  Session 19 was an exception - the materials were there.

- Well planned conference. Higher profile entertainment after Thursday evening would yield higher/greater attendance.

- 1st coffee break - too many people for 1 pot of coffee.
  5 pots??-make the break more effective.

  Smoking areas?

  What about juice/soft drinks.

  The theme was excellent - very well organized conference. The thrust from here will definitely be very positive.

- I just wish I could have attended more sessions.

  Norma's Quad system was great!

- #2 - description should have included "example and information related to high school only".

  Other sessions were excellent - Provocative, exciting! I am pleased at the range of experiences and heirarchial participants here - a true community involvement in learning about and sharing ideas about educating our children.

- In the area of evaluation of whole language I feel my questions were answered well. Many new perspectives on evaluation were presented and I have done lots of thinking about them. I will go back to my school with many valuable ideas to share. I'm glad I came.

- It would be helpful if presenters all had handouts. It is impossible to take notes especially when a speaker is moving from one area to another etc. Lloyd Nelson's presentation was excellent - handouts would have been appreciated.

  Overall an excellent 2 day workshop. I was disappointed that Personal Safety Evaluation was cancelled and would have appreciated knowing the rationale for its elimination as I understand from the presenter that she was ready to go.

- Prior to attending the conference I had some concern about how interesting and informative the sessions would be and I have been pleasantly surprised in regards to that.

- As a trustee, I found the philosophical approach to evaluation a good idea.

  My compliments to the committee for the excellent program!

- You did well to get Dr. Mark Holmes as a keynote speaker; he is very clear, very provocative. His stimulation was the basis for any success the conference had. You need really good keynote speakers for large conferences and you got one - well done in that respect. Marlborough Inn was a good choice too.

- It was a great pleasure for me to attend this conference. It was very well organized. Dr. Mark Holmes was an excellent keynote speaker. Whether you agree with his points or not, you would definitely walk away with a feeling that you, as well as others in your school division, would have to put much more thought into curriculum and program evaluation in the future.

- Dr. Nickelson was by far the most knowledgeable speaker.

  Dr. Holmes - spends too much time running down the valid research and not enough time supporting his own views with data. My impression is that he is too far removed from the field and doesn't know much about what happens in the classrooms today. Seems like an extreme conservative - not too sensitive to the real needs of children; would be best working with data alone and not with people.

- I found that half an afternoon or half a morning is not sufficient time to address the type of topic that is presented at this type of conference.

- Better pleased with last plenary - summed up nicely!